

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the present amendment and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 11-15 are pending in the present application. Claim 8 is amended to correct a minor informality, claims 9 and 10 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claim 15 is added by the present amendment. It is believed no new matter is added.

ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116:

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration. The present amendments to the claims were not earlier presented because Applicants believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tanabe in view of Jyumonji. This rejection is respectfully traversed because neither of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach the features of the pending claims.

Assuming *arguendo* that Tanabe and Jyumonji were able to be combined as suggested in the outstanding Office Action, such a combination would fail to teach or suggest the features of image processing of image data, as in the independent claims, for example.

In a non-limiting example, claim 1 recites that a teaching pendant includes a “unit used for manipulation for image processing.” Independent claims 4, 8 and 14 include similar features.

However, Tanabe merely discusses at column 3, lines 42-48 that an “operation” is carried out “with a picture or icon expressing a function displayed on a screen,” and Jyumonji only discusses “image analysis by the image processing device” at column 6, lines 39-42. However, neither Tanabe nor Jyumonji discuss or suggest a unit used for manipulation for image processing included in a teaching pendant, as in the independent claims.

Therefore, for at least these reasons independent claims 1, 4, 8 and 14 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Tanabe and Jyumonji, and it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIM 15

In addition, new claim 15 is added to set forth the invention in a varying scope. New claim 15 is similar to claim 1, and is directed to an image processing apparatus for a robot

including a display unit and a camera. Claim 1 further recites that the “display unit displays a video image from the camera that is continuously updated,” support for which is found in the originally filed specification at least in FIGS. 12 and 13 and at page 25, line 15 to page 26, line 2. It is believed no new matter is added.

In a non-limiting example, the specification at page 25, lines 15-21 recites in reference to FIGS. 12 and 13:

An item for display of a raw image from the camera is selected on the image processing apparatus menu of the teaching pendant. Then, a raw image of the gray scale of a camera is displayed on the teaching pendant. It is desired that a raw image is updated 30 times per second. However, the frequency of several times per second is acceptable as the minimal update frequency.

As an advantage, a lens may be adjusted to obtain an optimal configuration while watching the raw image displayed on the monitor screen of the teaching pendant (see the specification at page 26, lines 3-13).

In contrast, Tanabe merely discusses at column 3, lines 42-48 that an “operation” is carried out “with a picture or icon expressing a function displayed on a screen,” but does not describe or suggest displaying a video image that is continuously updated, as in the independent claims. Rather, such a “picture or icon” as discussed in Tanabe suggests only a stationary image, in contrast to the independent claims.

Moreover, Tanabe specifies at column 3, lines 15-21 that “an RS-232-C communication port of a serial interface standard is used as the communication port 32,” and it is respectfully submitted such a serial interface is deficient to supply a continuously updated video image, as in the independent claims.

Further, Jyumonji only discusses that “An image of a workpiece is taken by a CCD camera” (see the abstract of Jyumonji), but does not teach or suggest at least a teaching pendant, as in the independent claims.

Therefore, in addition to the reasons discussed regarding claim 1, new claim 15 is believed to be allowable for the above additional reasons.

Accordingly, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment this application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested. At a minimum, this amendment should be entered at least for purposes of appeal because it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

Serial No. 09/429,920

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/21/04

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501